

REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,812852 issued to Poulsen et al. (*Poulsen*). Applicant respectfully submits claims 1-30 are not anticipated by *Poulsen* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 17, 20, 27

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, the following:

generating at least one cache object during the execution of the second source code, wherein the private copies of each of the number of global storage objects are accessed through the at least one cache object during execution of the second source code.

Independent claims 11, 17, 20, and 27 similarly recite generating at least one cache object during the execution of the second source code, wherein the private copies of each of the number of global storage objects are accessed through the at least one cache object during execution of the second source code.

The Office action cites *Poulsen* as teaching the limitations of claim 1. *Poulsen* teaches a method for privatizing global storage objects. Objects to be privatized in *Poulsen* must be encapsulated in a structure. See column 5, lines 10-13. A copy of the structure is allocated for each thread. See column 7, lines 9-11. Each subroutine seeking to access the object must set up the base address of that object by calling a runtime library routine to retrieve the base pointer. See column 5, lines 15-20.

In contrast, claim 1 eliminates the requirement for a runtime library routine by generating at least one cache object during the execution of the second source code, wherein the private copies of each of the number of global storage objects are accessed through the at least one cache

object during execution of the second source code. *Poulsen* fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1, 11, 17, 20, and 27 are not anticipated by *Poulsen*.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 12-16 depend from claim 11. Claims 18-19 depend from claim 17. Claims 21-26 depend from claim 20. Claims 28-30 depend from claim 27. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant respectfully submits claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-19, 21-26, and 28-30 are not anticipated by *Poulsen* for at least the reasons described above.


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: MARCH 11, 2005


Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778